Public Works (1907) Department.

G.O., No. 554 / 555 } 9

DATED 24 12 1907.

3. 1. 1907

20 copies of G.O.
2

60 copies of letter
1

40 copies of notes
30 blue sheet

The Notes
in this G.O. have been printed.

[Despatch Abstract.]

Delay in the execution of the Contract for the Periyar sluices

Ordered that the Director General of Stores be informed with remarks that no penalty need be imposed on Messrs. Ransomes & Rapier in respect of the ———.

Letter to the D.G. of Stores.

P. W. 26
2,000—6-7-06.

Indexed
CS/DO/X

ABM
3-1-08

3/1/08

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

IRRIGATION.
ACCOUNT.

Government of Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Recd. } 1907. *Enclosures*

Regd. *Spare copies*

G.O., No. 554 I., 24th December 1907.

Delay in the execution of the contract for the Periyar sluices

Ordered that the Director-General of Stores be informed, with remarks, that no penalty need be imposed on Messrs. Ransomes and Rapier in respect of the —.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Irrigation.
Account.

Read—the following papers :—

I

Memorandum No. 313 O., dated 28th August 1906.

The Chief Engineer for Irrigation has the honour to invite the attention of the General Superintendent, Public Works Workshops, to the contract with Messrs. Ransomes and Rapier for the delivery of the Periyár regulator shutters forwarded to him with this office Memorandum, No. 1240, dated 5th April 1906, and to request that the General Superintendent will be so good as to state whether the parts of the shutters other than those to be built into masonry which were promised to be delivered by the 1st May have been received.

2. If the above parts of the shutters were received by the 1st May the Superintending Engineer, VI Circle, is requested to report whether he has received intimation from the Examiner, Public Works Accounts, that payment has been made.

C. A. Smith,
Chief Engineer for Irrigation.

To the General Superintendent, Public Works Workshops.
,, Superintending Engineer, VI Circle.

II

Letter—from H. B. Peirce, Esq., General Superintendent, Public Works Workshops.
To—the Chief Engineer for Irrigation.
Dated—Madras, the 1st September 1906.
No.—W. 14/E.I.

With reference to your memorandum No. 313 O., dated 28th August 1906, I have the honour to inform you that up to date no advice of shipment regarding any of the parts of the Periyár shutters other than those to be built into masonry has been received and apparently from the packing specifications the sill girders have not yet come forward. I am going to the Periyár next week and shall then be able to see exactly what parts to be built into the masonry have arrived.

III

Letter—from Mr. C. A. Smith, Chief Engineer for Irrigation, Madras.
To—the Director-General of Stores.
Dated—Ootacamund, the 12th September 1906.
No.—353-O.

In continuation of the correspondence ending with your telegram, dated 25th June, addressed to the Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, Madras, on the subject of sluice shutters under order from Messrs. Ransomes and Rapier, I have the honour to invite your attention to the fact that the contractors have failed to carry out the terms of their agreement.

2. It will be seen on perusal of the contract agreement that the parts to be fixed in masonry of which the sill girders referred to in the above-quoted telegram are a component should have been delivered by the 1st February and the remaining parts, which so far as is known have not been even now delivered, by the 1st May.

3. Great inconvenience has been experienced through the non-arrival of the sill girders and the construction of the regulator cannot be carried on in the best manner and the completed work may in consequence be less satisfactory than it should be.

4. As regards the remaining parts if they are not received in a very short time the work cannot be completed in the coming working season and Government will be put to a loss of revenue and interest on expenditure for a whole year.

5. I enclose a copy of a letter, dated 11th August 1905, from Messrs. Ransomes and Rapier from which and from the correspondence forwarded by you it will be seen that at no time did the contractors indicate that any such delays as have occurred were at all probable.

6. Under all the circumstances I consider that Government have very strong grounds for complaint as to their treatment in the matter, but before laying the case before Government I should like to have such explanation as Messrs. Ransomes and Rapier may have to offer. In the meantime I request that you will be good enough to withhold payment of the 3 per cent. per mensem on the contract amount specified in the contract bond as security for its due performance.

IV

Letter—from William Butler, Esq., Deputy Director-General of Stores.
To—the Chief Engineer for Irrigation, Madras.
Dated—India Office, London, S.W., 14th December 1906.
No.—S./16607.

I have the honour to enclose a copy of a report by the Consulting Engineer with reference to your letter No. 352 of 12th September 1906.

The final instalment of the sluice gates was shipped per S.S. "Rohilla" on 12th December 1906.

The amount of the contract is £12,250 and fines to the extent of £1,639-17-6 have been incurred.

These fines will be retained pending the receipt of a further communication from you or from the Government of Madras.

I may say, however, that in such a case as this, where the delay is undoubtedly due to difficulty in obtaining materials, it is not usual to enforce the fines.

Enclosure.

Report by the Consulting Engineer, dated 11*th December* 1906.

Messrs. Ransome's contract was delayed by non-delivery of materials and by nothing else. You know that I always insist that this is no valid excuse, but there is no doubt that in busy times contractors for work are in the hands of their sub-contractors for material, and that the latter will not accept penalty clauses. If India can make out a case of damage—real damage—by the delay, and insist on their pound of flesh, Ransomes must, I suppose, be fined. We here should be softer hearted I suspect and let them off. I think you had better keep the penalties in hand and let India decide the question.

V

Memorandum No. 68, dated 5th January 1907.

Letter to the Director-General of Stores, dated 12th September 1906, No. 353-O.
Letter from the Director-General of Stores, dated 14th December 1906, No. 16607-S.

In forwarding herewith copies of the marginally-noted correspondence to the Superintending Engineer, VI Circle, the Chief Engineer for Irrigation has the honour to request that the Superintending Engineer will be so good as to report whether he expects to have the regulator at the Periyár right bank escape completed before June, and if not, by what date.

The loss of revenue or otherwise that has or is likely to occur through the delay in supplying the shutters should be reported.

(By Order).

T. W. S. Smyth,
Asst. Chief Engineer for Irrigation.

To the Superintending Engineer, VI Circle.

VI

Letter—from S. D. Pears, Esq., Superintending Engineer, VI Circle.
To—the Chief Engineer for Irrigation.
Dated—Trichinopoly, the 16th March 1907.
No.—182/C.E.

In reply to your Memorandum No. 68, dated 5th January 1907, I have the honour to report that the right bank escape cannot be finished by June. The supply of labour is uncertain and will probably be more so in April, May and June, and I should say the earliest date by which it is likely to be finished and the rock bar removed in front is August 31st.

2. With regard to the loss caused by the delay I enclose copy of a letter from the Executive Engineer, Madura Division. His figures are not easy to follow. It was not to be expected, even had the contractors fulfilled their contract to the letter, that the regulator could have been at work in time to catch the monsoons of last year. Therefore there has been no loss up to, say, December 31st, 1906.

3. Assuming that the work *should* have been finished by December 31st, 1906, and *will* be finished by August 31st, 1907, the Executive Engineer's calculation of loss on establishment salaries would be about right, viz., 8 months at Rs. 500 a month = Rs. 4,000.

4. But with regard to loss of revenue from crops it is impossible to say what it may be. Should the south-west monsoon fail and the lake not fill to + 144 the loss will clearly be *nil*. On the other hand if (which is much more likely) water escapes freely over the + 144 level during July and August, it will then (but not before) be possible to translate the wasted millions of cubic feet into lost revenue. Till then however this part of your memorandum must remain unanswered. The Executive Engineer is not warranted in assuming that the lake would have filled to the top of the new shutters.

Enclosure.

Letter—from A. R. DeChazal, Esq., Executive Engineer, Madura Division.
To—the Superintending Engineer, VI Circle.
Dated—the 26th February 1907.
No.—113-S.E.

With reference to your No. 129, dated 10th January 1907, I have the honour to state that the parts of the iron work which are to be built into the masonry of the new right bank escape of the Periyár lake were to have been delivered in England on the 1st February and were expected to be landed on the work by the 1st April 1906. The blasting work had been practically finished by Christmas 1905 or about three months before the expected arrival of the iron work. The sill girders should have been sent first and nothing could be done until their arrival.

They are composed of single wrought-iron girder with a sill piece planed and rivetted to the girder with countersunk rivet. The drawings which were sent in advance by Messrs. Ransome and Rapier seem to have been purposely made, so that it could not be ascertained what were the dimensions of these sill girders. In one drawing they are shown as of cast iron and in another drawing of wrought iron. If I had been certain of the dimensions of these sill girders, I could have bought them in the Indian market and pushed on with the work. They were not despatched from Ammayanáyakkanúr until the 3rd of October and arrived on the work on the 7th. Work was at once started. We have now been working for 4 months and started building in the first set of vertical guides and roller path to-day 20th February 1907. We shall of course have to work throughout the hot weather, but it is very doubtful whether we shall succeed in finishing the work before the end of the south-west monsoon. We shall most probably lose the chance of filling the lake to the top of the gates during the next monsoon and possibly during the early part of the north-east monsoon. The lake is to-day at 9 feet below the crest of the escape, so that we may reasonably hope that if we had the regulator completed this hot weather we would secure at least enough water from the early part of the next monsoon to fill up the lake to the top of the new gates. This entails a loss of 2,300 millions cubic feet. The duty of a million cubic feet of capacity of the Periyár lake is about 24 acres. Calculating at even half of this duty, the extra capacity which will be gained by the raising of the F.T.L. will provide sufficient water for 27,770 acres or, say, 28,000 acres. I have not as yet sufficient distributaries dug for more than a portion of this area (probably $\frac{1}{3}$ of it); but there is no doubt that all the water available could have been utilized for 2nd crop cultivation. The loss sustained by Government may be estimated at a very low figure at—

	RS.
18,000 acres, 2nd crop at 2–8–0 an acre	45,000
10,000 „ 1st „ at 5–0–0 an „	50,000
	95,000

The extra cost entailed to the Government on account of Mr. L. S. Floate's services at Rs 250 a month, extra fitters, maistries and subordinates, may be put down at 8 months at Rs 500 = Rs. 4,000 making a total of Rs. 99,000.

2. I would also draw your attention to the fact that no forethought whatever was exercised by Messrs. Ransomes and Rapier in designing the component parts of the iron work.

Two sill girders arrived bent, this is due probably to the cranes which lifted them on board the steamer. Each sill girder was sent in one piece, though it could easily have been sent in two pieces, freight and carriage on which would have been much cheaper. Bowstring girders, plates 36 feet long, 4 feet wide were sent in one piece.

VII

Letter—from C. A. Smith, Esq., Chief Engineer for Irrigation, Madras.
To—the Director-General of Stores, India Office, Whitehall, London S.W.
Dated—the 28th March 1907.
No.—1280.

With reference to your letter No. S. 16607, dated 14th December 1906, I have the honour to state that owing to the delay in the supply of the shutters, there is a prospect of heavy loss in revenue but that whether such a loss will actually occur cannot be stated for six months from the present date. The question of the imposition of the proposed fine should therefore be held over. But meanwhile Messrs. Ransomes and Rapier may be informed that had reasonable despatch been made with the parts to be built into the masonry, no penalty would have been demanded.

2. I enclose for your information an extract from letter No. 113 S.E., dated 26th February 1907, received from the Executive Engineer, Madura Division, on the subject.

VIII

Letter—from E. G. Burls, Esq., Director-General of Stores.
To—the Chief Engineer for Irrigation, Madras.
Dated—India Office, London, S.W., the 26th November 1907.
No.—S./6802.

I have the honour to invite your attention to your letter No. 1280, dated 28th March 1907, relative to the penalty incurred by Messrs. Ransomes and Rapier in respect of delay in the execution of their contract for Periyár sluices, and to enquire what prospect there is of an early decision in the matter being arrived at.

Order—No. 554 I., dated 24th December 1907.

The following letter will be addressed to the Director-General of Stores.

[Here enter No. 555 I., dated 24th December 1907.]

(True Extract.)

Under Secretary to Government,
Irrigation Branch.

To the Chief Engineer for Irrigation, } with copy of letter.
,, Superintending Engineer, VI Circle, }

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

No. 555 I.

Irrigation.
Account.

LETTER—from

H. E. CLERK, ESQ.,

Ag. Joint Secretary to the Government of Madras,
Public Works Department
(Irrigation Branch),

To

THE DIRECTOR-GENERAL OF STORES,
INDIA OFFICE.

SIR,

With reference to your letter No. S. 6802, dated 28th November 1907, to the Chief Engineer for Irrigation, I am directed to inform you that no penalty need be imposed on Messrs. Ransomes and Rapier in respect of the delay in the execution of their contract for the Periyár sluices, as no loss of revenue has been caused thereby. I am, however, to state that it should be impressed on Messrs. Ransomes and Rapier that the delay on their part enhanced the difficulties attendant on the erection of the sluices, and it is hoped that should any orders be given them in future they will observe greater punctuality in complying with them.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

H. E. CLERK,
Ag. Joint Secy. to Govt., P.W.D.,
Irrigation Branch.

MADRAS,
24th December 1907.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT
(IRRIGATION BRANCH).

NOTES CONNECTED WITH G.O., Nos. 554, 555 I., DATED 24TH DECEMBER 1907.

[SUBJECT.—*Contract with Messrs. Ransomes & Rapier in connection with the regulator at the site of the Periyár right bank escape.*]

Who is looking after Messrs. Ransomes & Rapier's contract for new Periyár regulator, the General Superintendent or Executive Engineer, Madura?

They failed to carry out the first part of it and the matter should be looked into; they may fail to carry out the second part.

T. W. S. SMYTH.

Under Secretary—

With Memorandum No. 924, dated 13th March last, a note by the Chief Engineer regarding the arrangements to be made for the transport of the Stoney shutter materials to the Periyár right bank escape was forwarded to the General Superintendent, Public Works Workshops, and the Superintending Engineer, VI Circle, for attention. It was therein ordered that the General Superintendent should work in conjunction with the Executive Engineer, Madura, the precise nature of the duties by each officer being settled in consultation with the Superintending Engineer.

Certain instructions for the erection of these shutters which were received from Messrs. Ransomes & Rapier were communicated to the General Superintendent and the Superintending Engineer in Memorandum No. 1240, dated 5th April 1906.

In his letter No. 36 C.E., dated 8th June, the General Superintendent stated that the sill girders of the shutter frame work had not yet been advised as despatched and suggested that a cable be sent to the Director-General of Stores. A cable was accordingly sent and in reply the Secretary of State stated in June last that the girders were promised to be delivered for shipment in about three weeks (*vide* G.O., No. 1437 W., dated 6th July 1906).

From the above it is presumed that the General Superintendent is looking after Messrs. Ransomes & Rapier's contract in touch with the Executive Engineer, Madura.

A.R.
22-8-06.

A | Has the General Superintendent a copy of the contract? The penalty incurred for non-delivery of the parts to be fitted into masonry is only £30: 3 per cent. on £1,000 for one month as they appear to have been delivered before 9th March—*vide* letter and contract.

B | The General Superintendent should be sent the copy of the contract and asked if delivery of the remaining portion was made by 1st May and if so why no expenditure has yet been shown on this account.

T.W.S.S.
24-8-06.

Under Secretary—

With reference to portion marked **A** in Under Secretary's note, it is submitted that a copy of the contract with Messrs. Ransomes & Rapier together with the plans was forwarded to the General Superintendent, Public Works Workshops, with Memorandum No. 1240, dated 5th April 1906 (*vide* memorandum).

With reference to portion marked **B**, draft memorandum to the General Superintendent is submitted for approval.

A.R.
27-8-06.

T W.S.S.
27-8-06.

Will not the expenditure incurred in England be debited to the Madura division by the Examiner of Public Works Accounts? If so, how can the General Superintendent answer the last question?

C. A. Smith.
27-8-06.

Is this so?

T.W.S.S.
27-8-06.

Joint Secretary—

Yes.

2. The last clause of the memorandum has been struck off and paragraph 2 to the draft memorandum added in pencil.

A.R.
28-8-06.

C.A.S.
28-8-06.

[Issued as Memorandum No. 313-O., dated 28th August 1906.]

From the General Superintendent, Public Works Workshops, dated 1st September 1906, No. W./14-E.I.

Under Secretary—

In reply to Memorandum No. 313-O., dated 28th August 1906, the General Superintendent states that no advice of shipment of the parts of the Periyár shutters other than those to be built into masonry has been received. The General Superintendent states that he will go to Periyár next week and see exactly what parts to be built into masonry have arrived.

Submitted that the papers may be forwarded to Public Works Department u.o. with the request that the failure of Messrs. Ransomes & Rapier to carry out the work according to the contract may be brought to the notice of the Director-General.

Reply from the Superintending Engineer, VI Circle, to the memorandum has not yet been received.

A.R.
6-9-06.

No necessity to ask Public Works Department to do it. We may write ourselves. Point out (1) that the liability incurred in the first delay was so small that it was not considered worth mentioning. (2) that it is not known whether the remaining materials have yet been received by the Director-General and (3) that if not the contractors are liable to penalty up to end of August.

State that if the materials are not received before the end of October Government will undergo heavy loss and request deduction of liability above mentioned from their bill

T.W.S S.
6-9-06.

Under Secretary—

A draft order is submitted below which, if approved, may be forwarded to Public Works Department for acceptance prior to circulation to His Excellency the Governor.

A.R.
12–9–06.

Draft order not approved. The Director-General of Stores addressed direct by letter from the Chief Engineer for Irrigation No. 353-O., dated 12th September 1906.

[Letter to the Director-General of Stores, No. 353-O., dated 12th September 1906.]

Letter from the Director-General of Stores, dated 14th December 1906, *No. S.* 16607.

Under Secretary—

In reply to letter No. 353-O., dated 12th September 1906, the Director-General of Stores states that the final instalment of the sluice gates was shipped on 12th December 1906 and that the payment of a sum of £1,639–17–6 has been withheld, pending receipt of a further communication from the Chief Engineer for Irrigation or Joint Secretary to Government, Irrigation Branch, as to whether the delay in the delivery of the shutters resulted in any "damage", meaning apparently any loss of revenue to Government.

The Director-General of Stores states that, in a case like this where delay is due to difficulty in getting materials, it is not usual to enforce any penalty. It is observed, however, from the report of the Consulting Engineer of the India Office that the delay was due to the non-delivery of materials, apparently by the sub-contractors employed by Messrs. Ransomes & Rapier. With reference to this point, attention is invited to the latter portion of clause 7 of the conditions of contract, which provides that default or delay of sub-contractors, though their employment may have been sanctioned under clause 2, shall not be a reasonable ground for delay. It is now for consideration whether the facts of the case should be brought to the notice of Government in view of its being decided whether the payment to Messrs. Ransomes & Rapier of the whole or any portion of the sum noted by the Director-General of Stores should be withheld.

As the final instalment of the shutters is stated to have been shipped on the 12th December 1906 and may reach India shortly, it is submitted that the General Superintendent, Public Works Workshops, and the Superintending Engineer, VI Circle, may be informed accordingly at once.

M.A.
4–1–07.

S.G.V.

Before placing the matter before Government, it would be advisable to obtain a report from the Superintending Engineer as to whether he expects to have the regulator completed before June. It is understood that the great delay on the part of the Director-General of Stores in supplying a portable pneumatic rivetting apparatus

indented for in May last and concerning which at the request of the General Superintendent, Public Works Stores, a telegram has just been despatched to England is likely to affect the progress of the work.

T.W.S.S.
5–1–07

Approved. We have to show actual damage before we can give Messrs. Ransomes & Rapier.

C.A.S.
5–1–07.

To the Superintending Engineer, VI Circle, dated 5*th January* 1907.
From the ,, *VI* ,, ,, 16*th March* ,, *No.* 182 *C.E.*

Under Secretary—

In the above Memo. the Superintending Engineer, VI Circle, was asked to report whether the regulator at the Periyár right bank escape would be completed before June and if not by what date, and also whether the delay in the supply of shutters by Messrs. Ransomes and Rapier has resulted in any loss of revenue or otherwise that has or is likely to occur. In reply the Superintending Engineer in his letter quoted above states that the earliest date by which the regulator is likely to be finished is 31st August 1907.

2. As regards the question of loss caused by the delay in the supply of shutters by Messrs. Ransomes and Rapier, the Superintending Engineer reports that it was not to be expected that, even had they fulfilled the contract to the letter, the regulator could not have been at work in time to catch the monsoons of last year, and that there has, therefore, been no loss up to 31st December 1906.

The Superintending Engineer further states that assuming that the work should have been finished by 31st December 1906 and that it will be completed by 31st August 1907, the Executive Engineer's calculation of loss on establishment that will have to be kept on for eight months, amounts to Rs. 4,000. As regards the loss of revenue caused by the delay in the arrival of the shutters, the Executive Engineer calculates it at—

		RS.
Rs. 95,000, viz., 18,000 acres 2nd crop at Rs. 2–8–0 an acre	...	45,000
10,000 acres 1st crop at Rs. 5 an acre	...	50,000
Total	...	95,000

The Superintending Engineer does not, however, appear to accept the Executive Engineer's calculations and states that the latter officer is not warranted in assuming that the lake would have filled to the top of the new shutters.

For orders.

M.A.
21–3–07.

It is very difficult to estimate the damage, even in the simple case of establishment; the Executive Engineer apparently overestimates because, if the materials had been there to date, Mr. Float would have had to go up earlier (it is presumed that he was not sent up until actually required). As regards the loss of revenue, up to date no loss has occurred and all depends on the next monsoon if it is early so that the tunnel can be run full from early in June, there will be no loss of kodai (so-called second) crop. Nor will there be any loss this year if the monsoon fails altogether.

There probably will be a loss of kalam (first crop) as the area under irrigation cannot well be extended on *prospects* of increased supply.

T.W.S.S.
21-3-07.

It is clear that the actual loss up to date has been confined to extra establishment charges, the amount of which is uncertain and is probably not sufficient in itself to justify the infliction of the penalty in the face of the opinion of the Director-General. We must wait till the work is completed and if in the meantime water surpluses to waste we shall be in a position to show actual damage by loss of water.

C.A.S.
22-3-07.

Draft reply to the Director-General stating that owing to the delay there is a prospect of heavy loss in revenue but that whether such a loss will actually occur cannot be stated for six months from present date and that the question of the fine incurred should be held over. He may be asked to inform Messrs. Ransome and Rapier that had reasonable despatch been made with the parts to be built into the masonry no penalty would have been demanded and an extract (the first half) of the Executive Engineer's letter dated 26th February 1907, may be enclosed.

T.W.S.S.
22-3-07.

C.A.S.
23-3-07.

Under Secretary—

A draft letter to the Director-General of Stores, London, is submitted for approval.

M.A.
26-3-07.

From the Director-General of Stores, dated 26*th November* 1907, *No.* 6802-*S.*

No loss as there is plenty of water to start irrigation early next year.

T.W.S.S.
17-12-07.

Under Secretary—

For orders the Director-General of Stores may be informed that no loss has actually occurred and that therefore no penalty need be imposed on Messrs. Ransomes and Rapier.

2. The facts of the case are set forth in letter No. 1280, dated 28th March 1907, and the notes filed therewith. No subsequent report has been received on the matter from the Superintending Engineer.

S.D.
19-12-07.

Please see page 4 of these notes, as the reservoir was full in November there has been no loss of revenue.

T.W.S.S.
19-12-07.

Say that no penalty need be imposed as there has been no loss of revenue. At the same time it should be impressed on Messrs. Ransomes and Rapier, that the delay in the execution of their contract enhanced the difficulties attendant on the erection of the sluices.

H. E. CLERK.
20-12-07.

Under Secetary—

A draft letter to the Director-General is submitted which may issue under tour circulation rules.

S.D.
21-12-07.

T.W.S.S.
21-12-07.

Issue.

H.E.C.
21-12-07.

[Issued as G.O., Nos. 554, 555 I., dated 24th December 1907.]

READ the following:—

Print

To the General Supdt P.W. Workshops and SE VI Cir	No. 313-I d 28.8.06
From the General Supdt P.W. Workshops	No. W/14 E.3 d 1.9.06.
To the Director General of Stores, India Office	No. 353-I d 12.9.06
From —— Do ——	No. S 16607 d 14.[illegible] 06
To the Supg Engineer VI Circle	No. 68 d. 5.1.07
From —— Do ——	No. 182 CE d 16.3.07
To the Director General of Stores, India Office	No. 1280 d 28.3.07
From —— Do ——	No 6802 S d 26.11.07.

Print notes

554-I, D/ 24-12-07.

ORDER. Ordinary Press

Irrign Asst

15 P

The following letter will be addressed to the Director General of Stores:—

To 555-I, D/ 24-12-07.

The Director General of Stores
India Office

Sir,

With reference to your letter No S. 6802 dated 28.11.07 to the Chief Engineer for Irrigation, I am directed to inform you that no penalty need be imposed on Messrs Ransomes and Rapier in respect of the delay in the

To
The Chief Engr for Irrign (with copy of letter)
The S.E. VI

DESPATCHED
28 JAN 1908

execution of their Contract for the Periyar sluices, as ~~there has been~~ no loss of revenue has been caused thereby ~~owing to it~~.

I am, however, to state that it should be impressed on Messrs Ransomes and Rapier that the delay on their part enhanced the difficulties attendant on the erection of the sluices, and it is hoped that should any orders be given them in future they will observe greater punctuality in complying with them.

Issue

FWH
D.S.
21/12/07

HL
21.12/07

Despatched
20.12.07.

Rev
21/12/07

3

C. F. 73.

5563
5571

DEPARTMENT.

Paper taken out of the Records from the charge of the Referencer.

~~Press~~ Miscellaneous ~~Routine~~ No.——, dated 24-12- 19 07

Date taken out	For what purpose.			Initials of clerk taking the paper or of attender.	Date returned.	Initials of attender.
	Department.	C. No.	Year.			
-35	Mdro / III	5566/35			18-6-35	

17৪৪

ভূ- 1-17
মূল 1-14

2/6